

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 are pending in the present application after this amendment adds new claims 6 and 7. Claims 1, 2, and 5 are amended by this amendment. No new matter is introduced by the amendments, which find support throughout the specification and figures. In particular, the amendments are supported in the specification at page 5, lines 15-18 and figure 1, elements 14, SI 5, SI 6, SI 5bis, and SI 5ter. In view of the amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the pending claims be allowed.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner return an initialed copy of the Information Disclosure Statements (IDS) filed on April 20, 2004, in the next communication to the Applicants. A courtesy copy of the IDS is enclosed with this Amendment.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Claim 2 has been amended to respond to this objection by removing the term “type”, among other things. It is respectfully submitted that claim 2 as presented is definite, and it is therefore requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent Publication No. 2003/0819912 A1 to Laitinen et al. (hereinafter referred to as Laitinen). The Examiner asserts that all of the features of all of the claims are disclosed in Laitinen.

Claim 1 relates to a method of handover in a multimode mobile telecommunication network in which, to initiate a handover, the network sends to a mobile terminal a first group of system information via a first channel associated with circuit switching services and a second group of system information via a second channel associated with packet switching services. The method of claim 1 includes, *inter alia*, performing measurements at least in one neighboring cell

on a basis of information contained in the second group of system information, and sending to the network the measurements performed in step a). In the method according to amended claim 1, the *network sends to the mobile terminal the first group of system information via the first channel after the performing measurements operation.*

It is respectfully submitted that Laitinen does not disclose the feature of the network sending to the mobile terminal the first group of system information via the first channel *after* performing a measurement operation. The Examiner cites several sections of Laitinen in the Office Action, and apparently equates the PBCCH of Laitinen with the second channel of claim 1, and the BCCH of Laitinen with the first channel of claim 1. Without admitting the veracity of these assertions in the Office Action, Applicants respectfully submit that none of the cited sections of Laitinen disclose or suggest a group of system information being sent by a network on a channel *after measurements are performed* based on information previously transmitted on another channel. Since Laitinen does not disclose or suggest all of the features of amended claim 1, Laitinen does not anticipate claim 1.

Claims 2-4 and 6 depend from claim 1 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 is allowable.

Additionally, new claim 6 recites that the performing measurements operation is performed immediately upon receipt of the second group of system information. It is respectfully submitted that Laitinen does not disclose or suggest this feature, and therefore for at least this additional reason claim 6 is allowable.

Claim 5 recites a feature similar to claim 1 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 is allowable.


New claim 7 depends from claim 5 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 5 is allowable. Additionally, claim 7 recites that the means for performing measurements is adapted to perform the measurements immediately upon receipt of the second group of system information. It is respectfully submitted that Laitenen does not disclose or suggest this feature, and therefore for at least this additional reason claim 7 is allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the remarks set forth above, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,



Brian E. Hennessey
Reg. No. 47,521

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304
KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN
575 Madison Avenue
New York, NY 10022-2585
(212) 940-8800
Docket No.: NECW 20.768
BEH:pm